



UNIVERSITY
OF WOLLONGONG
AUSTRALIA

University of Wollongong
Research Online

Faculty of Social Sciences - Papers

Faculty of Social Sciences

2015

History of ESL pronunciation teaching

John Murphy

Georgia State University

Amanda Ann Baker

University of Wollongong, abaker@uow.edu.au

Publication Details

Murphy, J. M. & Baker, A. A. (2015). History of ESL pronunciation teaching. In M. Reed & J. M. Levis (Eds.), *The Handbook of English Pronunciation* (pp. 36-65). United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library:
research-pubs@uow.edu.au

History of ESL pronunciation teaching

Abstract

This chapter tells the story of over 150 years in the teaching of English as a second language (ESL) pronunciation. An analysis of historical resources may reveal a reliable history of pronunciation teaching. A consistent theme within the historical record is that prior to the second half of the nineteenth century pronunciation received little attention in L2 classrooms. Beginning in the 1850s and continuing for the next 30 years, early innovators such as Berlitz, Gouin, Marcel, and Predergast were rejecting and transitioning away from classical approaches. A change that resulted in pronunciation teaching's considerably more consequential second wave was the formation in Paris during the period 1886-1889 of the International Phonetic Association. The 1950s-1970s coincide with a slow rise of attention to innovations in how to teach pronunciation. If we may speculate on the future of ESL pronunciation teaching, there is every reason to feel optimistic.

Keywords

history, teaching, pronunciation, esl

Disciplines

Education | Social and Behavioral Sciences

Publication Details

Murphy, J. M. & Baker, A. A. (2015). History of ESL pronunciation teaching. In M. Reed & J. M. Levis (Eds.), *The Handbook of English Pronunciation* (pp. 36-65). United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

History of ESL Pronunciation Teaching

John M. Murphy & Amanda A. Baker

Abstract

This chapter's review of 150 years in the teaching of pronunciation is organized around four waves of instructional innovations. The first wave began in the 1850s and for over three decades prioritized imitative-intuitive ways of teaching. The second wave (1880s-early 1900s) witnessed the formation of the International Phonetic Association and the introduction of analytic-linguistic instructional practices. For much of the 20th century these first two waves vied for teachers' attention while specialists defined and illustrated the primary characteristics of English phonology. By the mid-1980s a third wave emerged which introduced classroom teachers to communicative means of teaching pronunciation. This third wave was led by specialists in instructional methodology and resulted in publication of several genres of innovative resource materials. It not until the mid-1990s, however, that empirical researchers began to explore foundational research questions designed to support pronunciation teaching, a defining characteristic of the field's contemporary fourth wave.

This chapter tells the story of over 150 years in the teaching of English as a second language (ESL) pronunciation. It is important to acknowledge at the outset that there is little direct evidence of pronunciation teaching practices for most of the modern era of English language teaching (ELT). Prior to the second half of the 20th century, there are neither video nor audio recordings of pronunciation teachers in action, reflective journaling appears to have been nonexistent (at least not in any retrievable format), and

the period's limited number of classroom research reports tended to focus on areas other than pronunciation teaching. Available evidence consists of specialist discussions of language teaching in general and of the teaching of pronunciation. Other sources include several published histories of ELT (e.g., Howatt & Widdowson, 2004; Kelly, 1969; Richards & Rodgers, 2001) and periodic reviews of pronunciation teaching (e.g., Anderson-Hsieh, 1989; Leather, 1983; Morley, 1991, 1994; Pennington & Richards, 1986; Pourhosein Gilakjani, 2012). Complementing these sources are analyses of English phonology, studies of the acquisition of second language (L2) phonology, teacher training materials, and related research reports. Starting in the 1990s, a few research studies compared the efficacy of different ways of teaching pronunciation (e.g., Couper 2003, 2006; Derwing, Munro & Wiebe 1997, 1998; Macdonald, Yule & Powers, 1994; Saito, 2007; Saito & Lyster, 2012a). However, it is only since the early 2000s that researchers have begun to document what typical pronunciation teachers actually do within classrooms (e.g., Baker 2011a, 2011b, 2014), and even these relatively recent contributions include a mere handful of classroom-focused reports.

As valuable as such published sources may be, there is little tangible evidence generated within classrooms of how ESL teachers have been teaching pronunciation during the past century and a half. One strategy for documenting pronunciation teaching's history, therefore, is to infer from published sources what teachers' likely classroom practices must have been. While traveling this path, it is worth distinguishing between published sources related to classroom events from which classroom practices may be inferred, and the actual classroom behaviors of pronunciation teachers. A close analysis of historical resources may reveal a reliable history of pronunciation teaching. It

is also possible, however, that some of the more interesting resources were not all that widely read, assimilated, and applied by classroom teachers. As in many fields, it takes time for specialists' contributions to influence wider audiences.

Before Pronunciation Teaching (1800-1880s)

A consistent theme within the historical record is that prior to the second half of the 19th century pronunciation received little attention in L2 classrooms. While Kelly (1969) reports that 3,000 years ago the Sanskrit grammarians of India “had developed a sophisticated system of phonology” (p. 60) and that educated Greeks of 1,800 years ago taught intonation and rhythm to adult learners of Greek, contributions made prior to the 19th century were lost over the centuries and failed to influence the modern era.

Reflecting ways of teaching Latin to children and young adults of the 1600s-1800s, variations of classical methods, which focused on the rigorous study of grammar and rhetoric, dominated in Europe and the Americas until at least the 1880s (L. G. Kelly, 1969; Howatt & Widdowson, 2004; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Historians group these various methods under the label “the Grammar Translation Method” though a version termed “the Prussian Method” was practiced throughout the United States by the mid-1800s (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 5). Teaching methods of the 19th century prioritized attention to the written language. While learners were expected to be able to read, understand, and translate literary texts, there was little expectation to speak the language of study. Historians surmise that during this period L2 teachers were not focusing learners' attention on pronunciation at all (see L. G. Kelly, 1969; Howatt &

Widdowson, 2004) and for most of the 19th century the teaching of pronunciation was “largely irrelevant” (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, Goodwin, & Griner, 2010, p. 3).

It would be a mistake, however, to perceive teaching practices of the 1800s as mere historical curiosities since ways of L2 and foreign language teaching that share much in common with classical methods are widely practiced in many parts of the world today (Hu, 2005). In China, for example, such a classical approach might be referred to as ‘the intensive analysis of grammar’ while in Korea the label ‘grammar/reading-based approach’ is sometimes used. When pronunciation is taught through such approaches, it typically involves simple repetition of sounds or words (e.g., Baker, 2011b). It is also worth keeping in mind that contemporary ways of teaching foreign languages within secondary schools, colleges, and universities throughout the Americas and many other parts of the world, as noted by Richards and Rodgers (2001), “often reflect Grammar-Translation principles” and that:

Though it may be true to say that the Grammar-Translation Method is still widely practiced [today], it has no advocates. It is a method for which there is no theory.

There is no literature that offers a rationale or justification for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology, or educational theory (p. 7).

The First Wave of Pronunciation Teaching: Precursors (1850s-1880s)

Beginning in the 1850s and continuing for the next 30 years, early innovators such as Berlitz (1882), who was a German immigrant teaching foreign languages in the eastern United States, Gouin (1880) in France, Marcel (1853) in France, and Predergast (1864) in England were rejecting and transitioning away from classical approaches. These specialists in L2 and foreign language teaching were interested in prioritizing speaking

abilities, although not necessarily pronunciation specifically. The primary innovation animating their work was to teach learners to converse extemporaneously in the language of study. Such a shift in instructional priorities may seem modest when viewed from a 21st century perspective, though their contemporaries would have perceived their proposals as rather odd. The truth is the innovations Marcel, Predergast, and Gouin championed had limited impact within language classrooms of their era, and failed to reach beyond specialist circles (Howatt & Widdowson, 2004). This theme of limited impact with respect to specialists' innovations is worth noting since it will recur throughout much of the 150 year period of this review. One of the reasons for lack of impact is that prior to the late 1880s there was no infrastructure (e.g., professional associations, annual conferences, serial publications) through which new ideas about language teaching might have become better known. A consolation is that Marcel, Predergast and Gouin were academics and their scholarship was known and discussed in specialist circles, especially in Europe. Though their influence in language classrooms was minimal at the time, their scholarship helped set the stage for the emergence of a focus on pronunciation teaching during the next decades. Also, their innovations are reflected in some of the more widely practiced language teaching methods of 20th century including the Direct (or Natural) Method (e.g., Sauveur, 1874), Situational Language Teaching (e.g., Hornby, 1950; Palmer, 1917), the Natural Approach (Terrell, 1977), and Total Physical Response (Asher, 1965).

In contrast to the modest diffusion of Marcel's, Predergast's, and Gouin's innovations, Berlitz developed into a business entrepreneur whose focus on teaching languages for conversational purposes became relatively well known. The first Berlitz

language school opened in Providence, Rhode Island in 1878 with the Berlitz brand reaching its peak of popularity about a quarter century later. By 1914, the Berlitz franchise had expanded to include 200 language schools throughout England, Germany, and the United States, and as of 2014, there continue to be over 550 Berlitz language schools in at least 70 countries worldwide. For better or worse, Berlitz schools constitute part of the legacy of mid-19th century innovators in language teaching. As Howatt and Widdowson (2004) explain, Berlitz “was not an academic methodologist” but he was “an excellent systematizer of basic language teaching materials organized on ‘direct method’ lines” (p. 224). Other than prioritizing the spoken language, most of Berlitz’s innovations (e.g., teachers never translate; only the target language is used in the classroom; the teacher is always a native speaker who is supposed to interact enthusiastically with learners) have long been in decline (see Brown, 2007). Along with direct and spontaneous use of the spoken language in L2 classrooms, the legacy of 1850s-1880s innovators includes a style of pronunciation teaching characterized by exposure, imitation, and mimicry. Following Celce-Murcia et al. (2010), we refer to this first wave in the history of pronunciation teaching with the label **“imitative-intuitive”** practice (p. 2).

The Second Wave of Pronunciation Teaching: The Reform Movement (1880s-early 1900s)

A change which brings us a giant step closer to the modern era, and one that resulted in pronunciation teaching’s considerably more consequential second wave, was the formation in Paris during the period 1886-1889 of the International Phonetic Association.

Supported by the work of several prominent European phoneticians (e.g., Paul Passy of France; Henry Sweet of England; Wilhelm Viëtor of Germany), the association formed in response to a societal need to transition away from classical approaches due to advances in transnational travel, migration, and commerce. Passy spearheaded the association's creation, Sweet became known as 'the man who taught phonetics to Europe,' and Viëtor's 1882 pamphlet (initially published in German under a pseudonym) titled *Language Teaching Must Start Afresh!* was both a catalyst for the association's formation and one of the Reform Movement's seminal manifestos. Among the association's earliest and most important contributions was the development circa 1887 of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). Though Passy published the first phonetic alphabet of the modern era in 1888, the International Phonetic Association based what would eventually become known as the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) on the work of Sweet (1880-1881). In admiration of this singular accomplishment, Setter and Jenkins (2005) observe that the intention of the IPA's designers was to develop a system of symbols "capable of representing the full inventory of sounds of all known languages" and that its continuing impact on the modern era of pronunciation teaching "is attested by the fact that, over a hundred years later, it is still the universally acknowledged system of phonetic transcription" (p. 2). In addition to developing the IPA and establishing a scholarly body charged with its continuing revision, the International Phonetic Association forged interest in pronunciation teaching through promotion of the following core principles:

- The spoken form of a language is primary and should be taught first.
- The findings of phonetics should be applied in language teaching.

- Teachers must have a solid training in phonetics.
- Learners should be given phonetic training to establish good speech habits.

(As cited by Celce-Murcia et al., 2010, p. 3)

Although the first principle echoes the innovations of the 1850s-1880s, the next three constitute the association's clearest break with earlier traditions and opened a modern era of pronunciation teaching quite different from the past. Propelled by the convergence of the International Phonetic Association, the four principles the Reform Movement championed, and the development of the IPA, the late 1880s witnessed the first sustained application of **analytic-linguistic** principles to the teaching of pronunciation. The source of the term 'analytic-linguistic' to characterize the Reform Movement's continuing impact is the following from Kelly (1969):

The ways of teaching pronunciation fall into two groups: intuitive and analytical. The first group [i.e., intuitive] depends on unaided imitation of models; the second [i.e., analytic] reinforces this natural ability by explaining to the pupil the phonetic basis of what he [sic] is to do (p. 61).

Celce-Murcia et al. (2010) offer a fuller definition of what analytic-linguistic approaches to pronunciation teaching entail. Although their definition reflects the spirit; it probably extends beyond what late 19th century reformers originally envisioned:

An Analytic-Linguistic Approach . . . utilizes information and tools such as a phonetic alphabet, articulatory descriptions, charts of the vocal apparatus, contrastive information, and other aids to supplement listening, imitation, and production. It explicitly informs the learner of and focuses attention on the sounds and rhythms of the target language. This approach was developed [in the

late 19th century] to complement rather than to replace the Intuitive-Imitative Approach [e.g., Direct Method appeals to mimicry, imitation], aspects of which were typically incorporated into the practice phase of a typical analytic-linguistic language lesson. (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010, p. 2)

Beginning in the 1890s and continuing throughout the first half of the 20th century, increasing numbers of language teachers explored and applied the International Phonetic Association's four core principles along with an evolving set of the analytic-linguistic instructional techniques for teaching pronunciation. Viewed from a historical perspective, this introduction of analytic-linguistic instructional practices signaled the formation of a 'second wave' in the history of ESL pronunciation teaching. The ebb and flow of this second wave would continue for most of the 20th century. Additional legacies of the International Phonetic Association are that it established a journal and sponsored regular meetings which were popular with both linguists and language teachers. In effect, as of the 1890s an infrastructure to support the expansion of pronunciation teaching had been born.

Reform Movement Innovations (1888-1910)

- Findings of phonetics were applied to language teaching and teacher training;
- Formation of pronunciation teaching's second wave through the use of analytic-linguistic instructional techniques;
- The IPA chart served as a classroom tool for teaching pronunciation;
- Instruction focused explicitly on sound segments (consonants and vowels);
- Learners listen to language samples first before seeing written forms;

- In the movement's first decade, teachers tended to provide phonetic information in great detail;
- Later, teachers realized learners could easily become overwhelmed and a focus on phonemic (broader, less detailed) rather than strictly phonetic information became the norm;
- First wave classroom techniques of mimicry and imitation continued; second wave incorporation of phonemic/phonetic information was used to support mimicry and imitation;
- Learners were guided to listen carefully before trying to imitate;
- As one way of practicing problematic vowel phonemes, ESL learners might be taught to say quickly and repeatedly two vowel sounds that are near, though not immediately adjacent to, each other on the English phonemic vowel chart. As a practice sequence of rapid repetitions of the two sounds continued the teacher would aim to "harness human laziness" until learners eventually began to produce an intermediate sound located between the two sounds initially introduced (Kelly, 1969, p. 66);
- To raise phonological awareness, ESL students might be asked to pronounce a sentence from their L1 as if a strongly accented native speaker of English were saying it. The intention was to increase learner awareness of pronunciation differences across languages;
- Similarly, to illustrate pronunciation characteristics to be avoided an ESL teacher might pronounce a sentence in English for ESL learners of L1 Spanish backgrounds as if it were spoken by a heavily accented L1 Spanish speaker of

English (with Spanish vowels and consonants). Later, the teacher would be able to “refer to this sentence now and again in speaking of the single sounds, as it will serve to warn the students against the kind of mistakes that they themselves are to avoid” (Jespersen, 1904, p. 154);

- Learners were taught to say sentences while mouthing words, consonants, and vowels in an exaggeratedly slow manner. The purpose was to use slow motion speaking as a way of “minimizing interference from the native phonemes and phonological systems” (Kelly, 1969, 66);
- For difficulties with consonant clusters in word final position, an ESL teacher might provide L1 Spanish speakers with practice featuring resyllabification (linking) (i.e., It’s a pencil → It –sa pencil; He’s a friend → He –sa friend). “As the pupil was made to repeat” such sequences “with increasing speed he [sic] found that he would remake the clusters without inserting the usual Spanish supporting vowel” (Kelly, 1969, p. 67).

Converging and Complementary Approaches (1890s-1920s)

The emergence of the Reform Movement did not mean that earlier ways of teaching pronunciation were disappearing. In fact, a recurring theme of this review is that two or more orientations toward pronunciation teaching are often in play concurrently. Some teachers work within one orientation or another while others find ways of either synthesizing or moving between different orientations. The co-existence of Intuitive-Imitative and Analytic-Linguistic orientations illustrated this phenomenon at the start of the 20th century. A similar pattern was repeated later in the century with the

rise of, for example, the Direct Method, Palmer's Oral Method (1920s), the Audio-Lingual Method and Situational Language Teaching (1960s), Cognitive Code learning (1970s), various designer methods of the 1970s, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (1980s), the 1980s-1990s' segmental/suprasegmental debate, Task Based Language Teaching (1990s), etc. The pattern is that each orientation introduces an underlying theory, garners specialist attention, prompts the development of teaching practices (and sometimes instructional materials), and informs the work of pronunciation teachers. While different ways of L2 teaching are, as noted by Hyland (2003) in reference to L2 writing instruction, "often treated as historically evolving movements, it would be wrong to see each theory growing out of and replacing the last" (p. 2). It would be more accurate to describe the different ways of pronunciation teaching witnessed over the past 150 years "as complementary and overlapping perspectives, representing potentially compatible means of understanding the complex reality" of pronunciation teaching (Hyland, 2003, p. 2).

Prior to the initial decades of the Reform Movement (1880s-1890s), the Direct Method had already established roots in the United States and Europe and it continued to gain in popularity well into the 20th century. Howatt and Widdowson (2004) suggest that the Direct Method probably reached the zenith of its influence in the years leading up to World War I (1914-1918). While Direct Method practitioners (e.g., those working within Berlitz franchise language schools) prioritized the spoken language, they emphasized the intuitive-imitative orientation of pronunciation teaching's first wave and were less interested in providing the degree of explicit phonemic/phonetic information advocated by Reform Movement enthusiasts. Their reticence is understandable since the

background of most Direct Method teachers was more likely to have been literature and/or rhetoric rather than the emerging science of phonetics. The profile of a typical Berlitz teacher of the early 20th century is also relevant to ELT conditions of the 21st century in this regard. Although Berlitz teachers were required to be native speakers of the target language, they were not particularly well trained as either linguists or as teachers beyond short-term workshops provided by the language schools with which they were associated. Howatt and Widdowson (2004) explain that most Berlitz teachers were sojourner adventurer-travelers interested in teaching their native language as a practical means for supporting themselves while seeing the world. As such, this co-occurrence of international enthusiasm for both the Direct Method and the Reform Movement during the initial decades of the 20th century foreshadows what would be a persistent and continuing theme. As first articulated by Kelly (1969, p. 61) over 40 years ago, the theme is that intuitive-imitative ways of teaching pronunciation continue to flourish “in the face of competition from [analytic-linguistic] techniques based on phonetics and phonology.”

These fundamentally different ways of teaching pronunciation raised two questions: (1) should teachers only ask students to listen carefully and imitate the teacher’s pronunciation to the best of their abilities; or, (2) beyond careful listening and imitating, should the teacher also provide explicit information about phonetics (i.e., how particular features of the sound system operate)? These questions continue to reverberate in contemporary ESL classrooms worldwide. To accomplish the latter was one of the Reform Movement’s expressed purposes. Adoption of Reform Movement principles called for a shift in ways of conceiving instructional possibilities by requiring teachers to

have specialized training in how the sound system of English operates. Writing a decade after the Reform Movement was well underway but voicing a decidedly pre-1880s perspective, Glauning (1903) suggested that the explicit introduction of information about phonetics “had no place in the classroom, despite the utility of the discipline [of phonetics] to the teacher” (cited in Kelly, 1969, p. 61). In contrast, specialists such as Jespersen (1904) and Breul (1898/1913) believed differently, recommending that “the use of phonetics [...] in the teaching of modern languages must be considered one of the most important advances in modern pedagogy, because it ensures both considerable facilitation and an exceedingly large gain in exactness” (Jespersen, 1904, p. 176). As with many present day ESL teachers, innovators prior to the Reform Movement had not considered possible facilitative effects of providing language learners with explicit information about the sounds and rhythms of the target language. Decades later, many teachers continued (and still continue) to lack sufficient preparation to be able to do so (see: Foote, Holtby, & Derwing, 2011). While proponents of the Reform Movement were enthusiastic about prioritizing conversational speech, they went further by supporting pronunciation teaching through analytic-linguistic descriptions of, information about, and explicit practice with the sound system being studied. In so doing, they were forming pronunciation teaching’s more inclusive second wave, one which embraced both imitative-intuitive and analytic-linguistic ways of teaching pronunciation.

At this point it is important to clarify how the term ‘analytic’ was used in the early 20th century since it differs from how the same term is currently applied in contemporary discussions of ESL instructional design (e.g., Long & Crookes, 1991). In the context of the Reform Movement the term ‘analytic’ referred to the role of the classroom teacher

who had studied the phonological system of the target language, had analyzed its relevant linguistic characteristics in anticipation of classroom teaching, and provided instruction in what the teacher considered to be a manageable number of characteristics through explicit (i.e., deductive, rule-based) instructional procedures. Throughout these various stages, it was the teacher who was responsible for doing the analyzing of the language system while, implicitly, learners were expected to re-synthesize (in modern terms) what had been presented to them in order to apply what they were learning to their own pronunciation. The featuring of either an analytic-linguistic component or an even broader analytic-linguistic orientation to pronunciation teaching, along with at least some attention to imitative-intuitive instructional practices, is reflected in most, though not all, of the approaches to pronunciation teaching of the 20th century and beyond. However, an analytic-linguistic orientation complemented by an integration of both imitative-intuitive and analytic-linguistic instructional practices is featured in most of the more popular pronunciation-dedicated ESL classroom textbooks of the modern era (e.g., Dauer 1993; Gilbert 2012a, 2012b; Grant, 2007, 2010).

A Period of Consolidation (1920s-1950s)

The four decades between the time of the Direct Method's greatest influence (circa 1917) and the heydays of the Audiolingual Method (ALM) in North America and Situational Language Teaching in Great Britain (1960s) offer several lessons. Prior to the 1920s, Reform Movement proponents had already established the importance of understanding how phonological systems operate. Phoneticians interested in English were incredibly productive during this period. Starting early in the 1900s they were documenting its major phonological elements with impressive detail (e.g., Bell, 1906;

Palmer, 1924). By the early 1940s, specialists had provided detailed descriptions of native English speaker (NES) pronunciation including most of its segmental and suprasegmental elements. Kenneth Pike (1945), for example, was an early innovator who provided lasting descriptions of the American English intonation system. Pike's contribution in this area was celebrated by Bolinger (1947, p. 134) as "the best that has ever been written on the subject" in order to address a need to teach English pronunciation. Pike's identification of a 4-point pitch scale (4 = extra high; 3 = high; 2 = mid; 1 = low) has retained its currency, with some of the most prominent teacher guidebooks on pronunciation pedagogy today continuing to use a similar 4-point system (e.g., Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). Several years later, linguists in the UK developed similar descriptions of British English intonation (Kingdon, 1958a; O'Connor & Arnold, 1961) and stress (Kingdon, 1958b) which were regarded as excellent texts for language teachers and learners alike (Pledd, 1960; Wells, 1998).

By the mid 1950s, Abercrombie had published several innovative discussions of pronunciation teaching (e.g., 1949a, 1949b) which featured prescient discussions of the role of intelligibility and the use of transcription in ESL classrooms (e.g., Abercrombie, 1956). It is no exaggeration that Abercrombie's comments on the role of intelligibility, including the need for its prioritization in pronunciation teaching, resonate with contemporary themes (e.g., Brazil, 1997; Levis, 1999; Munro & Derwing, 2011). Of course, specialist descriptions of how the sound system of English operates are continuously being fine-tuned (e.g. Leather, 1999; Ladefoged, 2006) but most of the basic information about the L1 phonology of English was available by the end of the 1940s. The period 1920s-1950s was a time of consolidation focused on documenting

how the sound system of English operated through research into its linguistic code. However, with few notable exceptions (e.g., Clarey & Dixon, 1947; Lado, Fries, & Robinett, 1954; Prator, 1951) less attention was being given to innovations in teaching practices. During the 1920s-1950s specialists were responding to one of the Reform Movement's primary themes: to be able to teach pronunciation language teachers need to understand how its phonological system operates.

The decade of the 1930s, a period which was straddled by two world wars, is especially revealing as it coincided with a decline of interest in pronunciation teaching on both sides of the Atlantic. In the United States, the Coleman Report (1929) sparked a national initiative to prioritize the teaching of reading in foreign language classrooms. A similar initiative was also promoted by the British specialist Michael West (e.g., 1927/1935) whose focus on the teaching of reading and vocabulary impacted many parts of the British colonial world. In particular, the Coleman Report proposed "reading first" as an overarching strategy for organizing language instruction along with the principle that development of a reading ability is "the only realistic objective for learners with only a limited amount of study time" (Howatt & Widdowson, 2004, p. 268). Though the Coleman Report focused on the teaching of modern foreign languages and West's recommendations focused on English as a foreign language instruction, their respective influences on the broader field of language education coincided with a period when innovations beyond pronunciation teaching's first two waves, were, and would continue to be, curiously missing and from the scene.

During this same period, scholars began to question notions of 'standard' or 'correct pronunciations' of English (Kenyon, 1928; McCutcheon, 1939; Wilson, 1937).

With different English dominant countries and diverse regions of those countries having widely varying pronunciations spoken by what was referred to at the time as ‘cultivated’ speakers of English, assumptions that a particular standard of English existed began to decline. As argued by Kenyon (1928, p. 153),

...is it so certain as it is so often assumed to be, that uniformity of speech is a supremely desirable end? It certainly is not necessary for intelligibility, for those speakers of the various types of English, - Eastern, Southern, and General American, Northern and Southern British, and Standard Scottish, - who speak their own type with distinctive excellence have no difficulty whatever in understanding one another.

This period, in many ways, represents the origin of more recent trends and advocacy to ‘teach for intelligibility’ among international users of English (e.g., Jenkins, 2000).

Despite these earlier challenges to standard models of pronunciation, for the rest of the 20th century descriptions of native English speaker (NES) phonology continued to serve as the basis for ‘what’ to teach in most ESL classroom worldwide.

Competing Conceptual Paradigms: 1950-1970s

The 1950s-1970s coincide with a slow rise of attention to innovations in how to teach pronunciation. One way of discerning the instructional practices of a particular era is to examine some of the classroom materials that were available and widely used at the time. This is our strategy for describing some of the innovations during this period. We begin the section by examining four different versions of a text of considerable historical interest titled, *Manual of American English Pronunciation (MAEP)* (Prator, 1951; Prator

& Robinett 1957, 1972, 1985). The *MAEP* was a popular ESL course text dedicated to pronunciation teaching used in US colleges and universities as well as other institutions within the US sphere of influence (e.g., Latin America, the Pacific Rim) for well over 20 years. Though its general structure held constant during this period, the *MAEP* was modified several times as its initial author (Clifford Prator) and eventual co-author (Betty Wallace Robinett) continued to expand and revise it through four editions spanning three decades. Differences between its various editions reflect some of the substantive changes in pronunciation teaching between the early 1950s and the mid-1980s. The history of the *MAEP*'s revisions is all the more interesting since its 1951 and 1957 editions preceded the heyday of ALM while its third and fourth editions came after the field had already begun to experience ALM's decline. Before continuing with a fuller discussion of the *MAEP*, we must first describe the role of pronunciation within ALM to better contextualize pronunciation teaching during the 1960s-1970s, a controversial period of conflicting theoretical perspectives.

ALM and Pronunciation Teaching (1960-1975): Conflicting Perspectives

Although the Reform Movement had introduced an analytic-linguistic component to pronunciation teaching decades earlier, classroom procedures well beyond the first half of the 20th century continued to follow a lesson sequence of information-transmission phases in which a teacher may have introduced and explained (teachers did not always do so) particular features of English phonology (e.g., sound segments) followed by imitative-intuitive practice opportunities that featured choral and individual repetition, dialogue practice and other forms of what today would be characterized as teacher-

controlled speaking opportunities. As ALM (in the United States) and Situational Language Teaching (in the UK) became widely adopted in the 1960s, imitative-intuitive practice was especially prominent even if it was occasionally supported by a teacher's analytic-linguistic explanations of phonological features. ALM prioritized attention to spoken forms, though it did so by organizing instruction around oral pattern practice drills and through the intentional overuse (literally) of repetition, mimicry, and memorization. As interest in ALM spread, the tide of pronunciation teaching's first wave (imitative-intuitive) was once again on the rise worldwide. Concurrent advances in technology contributed to the spread of ALM since pattern practice with spoken forms was emphasized both in the classroom and beyond with the support of language laboratories and, a few years later, portable cassette tape players. Spoken accuracy in stress, rhythm, and intonation was prioritized through imitative-intuitive practice which was right in line with theories of Skinnerian Behavioral Psychology upon which ALM was based. Lamentably, one impact of the heightened international status of ALM during this period was to divert attention away from other innovations in L2 instruction just getting under way, including the Audio-Visual Method in France (e.g., CREDIE, 1961), the Council of Europe's Threshold Level project initiative (Van Ek, 1973), and Widdowson's (1972) early calls to teach language as communication. At a time when some language instruction specialists were broadening their outlook "and devising new ways of teaching meaning, the [language] lab [as featured in ALM teaching] appeared to be perpetuating some of the worst features of [imitative-intuitive] pattern practice" (Howatt & Widdowson, 2004, p. 319).

Although the ‘what’ of pronunciation teaching had been coming into its own during the 1920s-1960s, the quality of instructional strategies in ‘how’ to teach phonological features stagnated in many classrooms with the rise of ALM. To put it bluntly, ALM’s influence led to a suppression of analytic-linguistic innovations as well as a delay in the rise of pronunciation teaching’s subsequent waves. On a more positive note, there was a short lived flirtation with Cognitive Code learning in the early 1970s, a popular theory which described language learning as an active mental process rather than a process of habit formation. Gattegno’s (1963) work with the Silent Way in the 1960-1970s was premised upon similar themes. Some of the implications of Cognitive Code learning might have led to more analytic-linguistic styles of pronunciation teaching but its implications were more often associated with the teaching of grammar. However, the Cognitive Code perspective resonated with at least some teachers’ interests in pursuing more analytic-linguistic ways of teaching. Our reason for this brief digression into a discussion of ALM and its impacts during the 1960s and beyond was to set a fuller historical context for the role Prator and Robinett’s *MAEP* would play as a precursor to what eventually became pronunciation teaching’s ‘third wave’ in the mid-1980s.

Three Innovators of the 1960s-1970s: Clifford H. Prator, Betty Wallace Robinett, and J. Donald Bowen

Although Prator and Robinett’s *MAEP* is not representative of ALM instructional practices, many of the ESL students of the 1960s-1970s who worked with it had probably completed much of their preceding study of English within ALM-infused classrooms. By the time of its third edition (1972), most ESL teachers were either well aware of ALM

instructional practices or were ALM trained themselves. As well as being used in pronunciation-centered ESL courses, the *MAEP* served as a resource for teachers who offered alternative course types (e.g., more broadly focused courses) but who were interested in including some attention to pronunciation. Its 1985 edition coincided with an era of nascent attention to communicative styles of pronunciation teaching which Prator and Robinett both acknowledged (see p. xvi) and attempted to incorporate into the *MAEP*'s final version.

Written with advanced-level ESL student readers in mind, the *MAEP* is filled with well contextualized information on how the sound system of English operates as well as (what were at the times of its various editions) state-of-the-art inventories of controlled and guided practice activities. In a revealing side note, the *MAEP* also supported ESL teacher training within MATESOL/Applied Linguistics courses up until the mid 1980s (Clifford A. Hill, Columbia University, class notes). Since its two earliest editions predated the advents of ALM, Cognitive Code, and CLT, they offer a revealing look into what were some of the more innovative ways of teaching pronunciation during the 1950s-1970s. When viewed from a contemporary vantage point, the *MAEP* illustrates post Reform Movement perspectives, principles, and instructional practices (e.g., explicit attention to phonetic detail, technical explanations, charts, diagrams, as well as additional visual and audio supports). Its several editions were informed by over 60 years of specialist awareness and research into the phonology of English coupled with Reform Movement recommendations on how to teach it. Naturally, the co-authors' original insights played a major role as well. For example, the *MAEP*'s inclusion and sequencing of topics were informed by a needs analysis of "several thousand" international students

attending the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) over a three year period (p. xix). Eventually, the *MAEP*'s 1985 edition incorporated communicative activities with a moderate degree of success (though most would be considered dated by today's standards), an innovation the co-authors discussed as follows:

The most significant kind of change in the new edition . . . is the result of the effort we have made . . . to introduce more use of language for real communicative purposes in the learning activities for students to carry out. The authors have always shared the belief among teachers that languages cannot really be learned unless they are used for purposes of [genuine] communication.

Without communicative intent, pronunciation is not true speech; it is no more than the manipulation of linguistic forms (p. xvi).

The *MAEP*'s practice exercises incorporated contextual information and cues to differentiate phonological features including phonemes, thought groups, phonological processes (e.g., linking, assimilations, palatalization, coalescence), suprasegmentals (word stress, sentence stress, rhythm), and intonation (e.g, rising-falling, rising, prominence, affective meaning). Learners were expected to develop a recognition facility in the use of phonemic symbols, and occasionally were asked to transcribe brief segments of speech. Though written for intermediate to advanced level ESL readers, its 18 chapters provided learners with extensive technical information on the English phonological system supported with an abundance of practice opportunities. As such, the *MAEP* was a mature illustration of pronunciation teaching's second wave. Even its less successful attempts to incorporate communicative activities illustrate that its authors were anticipating pronunciation teaching's next wave. With the exception of teacher training

programs that feature a course dedicated to the teaching of ESL pronunciation, the levels of comprehensiveness and detail about the sound system of English included in the *MAEP* are likely beyond the scope of many ESL teacher preparation courses at the present time (see Burgess & Spencer, 2000; Foote et al., 2011; Murphy, 1997). The *MAEP*'s decades long publication history illustrates the surprisingly high quality of second wave resources that were starting to be available during the 1950s-1970s. A limitation is that the *MAEP* was designed to be used with relatively advanced-level college and university ESL learners. Though perhaps unintended, an implication was that attention to pronunciation can be delayed until a higher level of language proficiency has been attained by university age ESL learners enrolled in pronunciation-centered courses. This perspective on when and how to focus instruction would be challenged successfully through the contributions of third wave specialists in ESL pronunciation teaching and materials developers of the mid-1980s and beyond.

“Bowen’s Technique”

Also active during an era when pronunciation was taught primarily through intuitive-imitative means, Bowen (1972, 1975) developed a novel set of analytic-linguistic techniques for contextualizing pronunciation teaching “with a classic format that is still recommended, for example, by Celce-Murcia and Goodwin (1991) who refer to it as ‘Bowen's Technique’” (Morley, 1991, p, 486). Particularly innovative for its time, Bowen (1975) was:

. . . not a textbook in the usual sense of the term. But a supplementary manual designed to help a motivated student . . . intended to be used along with a [more

broadly focused non-pronunciation ESL] text, preferably in short, regular sessions that use only five or ten minutes of the class hour (p. x).

The teaching strategies central to Bowen's work are described in detail by Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, pp. 9-10 & 147-148). In brief, they involve listening discrimination and subsequent speaking practice in which minimal pairs are contextualized at the level of whole sentences while supported by the use of visuals, props, physical gestures and other supports. A core innovation Bowen introduced was to target minimal pair practice beyond the level of individual words by embedding phonological contrasts within whole phrases and sentences. Also, what Bowen defined as a 'minimal pair' extended well beyond consonant and vowel phonemes and embraced an ambitious array of phonological processes such as word stress, juncture, prominence, and intonation. Like Prator, Bowen was a second wave innovator from UCLA who published journal articles and instructional materials during a period when most of his contemporaries were either teaching pronunciation through imitative-intuitive means, or were not teaching pronunciation at all. Twenty-four years later Henrichsen, Green, Nishitani, and Bagley (1999) extended the premises of Bowen's work with an ESL classroom textbook and teacher's manual that contextualize pronunciation practice at even broader discourse levels (e.g., whole narratives rather than individual sentences). Chela-Flores (1998) provides another application of Bowen's innovations to the teaching of rhythm patterns of spoken English. In sum, innovators such as Prator, Robinett, and Bowen illustrate that behind the chorus of voices that have been lamenting the demise of ESL pronunciation teaching since the 1970s, there is a fuller backstory to tell.

Designer Methods of the 1970s

As reviewed thus far, the professional environment within which ELT takes place has been inconsistent in support for pronunciation teaching. Following ALM's decline in the 1970s, some constituencies (e.g., North American MATESOL programs) seemed preoccupied for a decade or more with what specialists now refer to as the 'designer methods' of the 1970s. Along with ALM and Cognitive Code instructional models as previously discussed, these included Counseling-Learning/Community Language Learning (C-L/CLL), the Silent Way, Suggestopedia, comprehension approaches such as Total Physical Response (TPR) and the Natural Approach, among others. In some cases, their ways of teaching pronunciation contrasted wildly from each other and several were founded on principles reminiscent of debatable values of the past. For example, the unique and poorly understood nature of teacher modeling of the Silent Way depended heavily upon an imitative-intuitive approach while its proponents argued that they were appealing to learners' analytic abilities to discern linguistic patterns. Suggestopedia might be characterized as an intuitive-imitative approach on steroids since it anticipated students' heightened mental states of 'superlearning' through exposure to massive amounts of scripted spoken discourse. TPR, the Natural Approach, and other comprehension approaches shared the principle that learners should be provided with opportunities to demonstrate comprehension while expectations for learners to begin to speak are delayed. Some of C-L/CLL's explicit purposes which may be of interest were to foster an affectively comfortable classroom, learner-centered lessons, learner-controlled practice opportunities, as well as analytic-linguistic opportunities to focus on language form (including pronunciation). Eventually, as the field lost interest in designer

methods fewer teachers learned of some of their possibly useful elements (e.g., comprehension approaches' flooding of the learner with well contextualized spoken input; C-L/CLL's learner-controlled procedure for focusing on pronunciation through use of the 'human computer' technique). Following a path charted by Berlitz in the 19th century, several of the designer methods became business enterprises which by the mid-1980s had drifted to the periphery of ESL teaching where they remain today.

The Third Wave: Communicative Styles of Pronunciation Teaching (mid 1980s–1990s)

Along with the final edition of the *MAEP*, the 1980s witnessed CLT's considerable expansion of impact on pronunciation teaching. Emerging from a European tradition, CLT offers a broad orientation to ways of organizing language instruction which can be applied flexibly depending upon particular contexts of learning and learners' needs. CLT's adaptable nature stands in sharp contrast to the more rigid prescriptions and proscriptions of Berlitz-type orientations as well as the various designer methods of the 1970s. Though CLT principles were well known in specialist circles by the start of the 1980s, it took several more years for methodologists to begin to apply them to ESL pronunciation teaching. Those who did so successfully were ushering in pronunciation teaching's impactful 'third wave.' In 1983, Marianne Celce-Murcia (also from UCLA) published the first journal article of which we are aware to center on principles and activity-development guidelines for teaching ESL pronunciation through communicative means. Appearing soon afterward, Pica's (1984) journal article featured similar themes. A few years later, Celce-Murcia's (1987) subsequent book chapter followed with an expanded discussion of how to teach pronunciation communicatively.

Each of these seminal discussions featured a generous number of activity descriptions illustrating practical ways to implement CLT principles and guidelines as integral dimensions of pronunciation teaching. It is worth noting that both Celce-Murcia and Pica were academic researchers who sometimes served as specialists in ESL instructional methodology. Curiously, the foci of their respective research agendas were areas other than pronunciation teaching. When writing about the teaching of ESL pronunciation they were not reporting empirical studies but were donning the hats of instructional methodologists. There are at least three reasons for proposing that they wore those hats particularly well. First, each of the three publications mentioned was grounded firmly in CLT theory and principles. Second, the guidelines presented were easy to understand and remember, even if teachers who lacked training in English phonology may have found them challenging to apply. Third, since the illustration activities Celce-Murcia and Pica provided were straightforward, it was possible for ESL teachers who had requisite background to test them out in their own classrooms.

Celce-Murcia, Pica, and other early third wave innovators of the 1980s (e.g., Acton, 1984; De Bot, 1983; Gilbert, 1978; Morley, 1987; Naiman, 1987; Wong, 1987) had access to professional associations including AAAL, ACTFL, IATEFL, TESOL, and regional affiliates. As a consequence, general CLT themes were already familiar to a growing number of ESL teachers. In contrast to innovators of the 1850s-1880s, by the 1980s a professional infrastructure was in place which featured conventions, serial publications, newsletters, and less formal networking opportunities. Within a few years, Celce-Murcia's (1983, 1987) and Pica's (1984) innovations were being championed by

ESL materials developers who would soon publish a succession of innovative pronunciation-centered classroom textbooks.

The Third Wave's First Genre of Professional Literature: ESL Classroom Textbooks
(mid 1980s-present)

Actually, it is difficult to determine whether or not classroom teachers and materials developers beyond the mid-1980s were directly influenced by innovators such as Celce-Murcia and Pica, or if the impulse to apply CLT principles to the teaching of pronunciation was part of the zeitgeist of the era. Either way, mid-1980s innovations serve as a pivotal historical reference point since ESL methodologists were opening a new path by fusing communicative sensibilities to the imitative-intuitive and analytic-linguistic teaching practices previously established. These innovators inspired three especially useful genres of resource literature further enhancing pronunciation teaching's third wave. The first genre is textbooks intended to be used in pronunciation-centered ESL courses. Classroom textbooks by Beisbier (1994, 1995), Brazil (1994), Chan (1987), Dauer (1993), Gilbert (1984), and Grant (1993) were organized around CLT principles. They were early examples of third wave classroom textbooks that have continued to grow in number with revised and expanded editions of Gilbert's and Grant's original illustrations (Gilbert, 2012b; Grant, 2010) along with more recent illustrations such as Cauldwell (2012), Gilbert (2012a), Gorsuch, Meyers, Pickering & Griffiee (2012), Grant (2007), Hahn & Dickerson (1999), Hancock (2003), Hewings (2007), Lane (2005), Marks (2007), Miller (2006) and Reed and Michaud (2005).

Of this first genre, Gilbert's *Clear Speech* series (including five separate editions of the original *Clear Speech*, *Clear Speech from the Start*, and *Speaking Clearly British edition*) has been the most successful and widely used classroom series focused on teaching ESL pronunciation of the modern era. When asked what were some of the antecedents to her work on the original *Clear Speech* (1984), Gilbert explained:

Perhaps my earliest influences were Wallace Chafe [1976] who wrote about the prosodic concept of New Information/Old Information and then Joan Morley [1984], who impressed me with the significance of listening comprehension. [Before writing the first *Clear Speech* text] I visited J. Donald Bowen [see above] as he was preparing a draft of *Patterns of English Pronunciation* (1975). From Bowen I adapted the idea of 'minimal sentence pairs,' as opposed to 'minimal word pairs.' This approach led to my most common form of instructional practice: student pairs give each other a 'minimal sentence pair' choice of answer. If the speaker gets the wrong answer from the listener, then this provides immediate feedback of a conversational breakdown (either in production or listening comprehension).

Gilbert, J. (11/23/2012 personal communication)

The Third Wave's Second Genre: Activity Recipe Collections (1990s-2012)

A second genre inspired by mid-1980s innovations is activity recipe collections (ARCs) focused on pronunciation teaching. These are whole books written for ESL teachers which feature descriptions of many dozens of pronunciation activity prototypes. The fact that the three earliest illustrations of the genre (Bowen & Marks, 1992; Hancock, 1996; Laroy, 1995) were written by British specialists may be a reflection of CLT's

European roots. Their books differ from first genre teaching materials since ARCs are not classroom textbooks. Rather, ARCs are book-length collections of stand-alone activities designed as resources for teachers to digest, tailor to their own contexts of teaching, try out in ESL classrooms, and modify as needed. While ARCs had previously been established as a teacher resource staple of the field for the teaching of grammar, reading, spoken fluency, and writing (e.g., Hedge, 1988; Ur, 1988), Bowen and Marks (1992) is the first ARC dedicated to communicative ways of teaching pronunciation while Hewings (2004) and J. D. Brown (2012) are the genre's most recent illustrations. With the exception of the latter, as well as short sections of Bailey and Savage (1994; see pp. 199-262), and Nunan and Miller (1995; see pp. 120-150), those currently available feature British styles of pronunciation.

The Third Wave's Third Genre: Teacher Preparation Texts (late 1990s-present)

The final decades of the 20th century witnessed another notable advance and with it a third genre of professional literature: the publication of high quality resource books dedicated to the preparation of ESL pronunciation teachers. As of 2014, over a dozen examples of this genre have been published, most notably Celce-Murcia et al. (1996) (followed by a 2010 revised and expanded edition), Lane (2010), and Rogerson-Revell (2011). While Celce-Murcia et al. and Lane prioritize patterns of North American pronunciation, Rogerson-Revell's is a specifically British text. In contrast, Walker (2010) focuses not on teaching traditional native-speaker standards of English pronunciation but the pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). Kenworthy (1987) merits special attention since it was the first teacher preparation volume of the

modern era to focus on how to teach ESL pronunciation. Also, its publication coincided with the centennial anniversary of the birth of the Reform Movement. Other notable examples include Avery and Ehrlich (1992), Dalton and Seidlhofer (1994), Underhill (1994), Fraser (2001), Gilbert (2008), G. Kelly (2000), Lane (2010), as well as an early booklet by Wong (1987) and later booklets by Murphy (2013) and Poedjosoedarmo (2003). A central feature each of these texts shares is their sustained focus on how to teach ESL pronunciation, a focus Burgess and Spencer (2000), Burns (2006), Foote, Holtby, and Derwing (2011), and Murphy (1997) document as lacking in many contemporary ESL teacher preparation programs. Availability of this very helpful genre of teacher preparation material is fitting testimony to the efforts of pronunciation teaching specialists of the preceding 150 years.

Pronunciation Teaching Specialists (1980s-1990s)

In addition to inspiring three new genres of published resources to support ESL pronunciation teaching, third wave innovators of the mid-1980s also prompted a trend in the type of specialist who would drive the field of pronunciation teaching for the next two decades. The trend was that during the 1980s-1990s the most influential authors and conference presenters on the topic of pronunciation teaching were specialists in instructional methodology (e.g., William Acton, Donna Brinton, Berta Chela-Flores, Wayne Dickerson, Suzzane Firth, Judy Gilbert, Janet Goodwin, Joanne Kenworthy, David Mendelsohn, John Levis, Joan Morley, John Murphy, Neil Naiman, Charles Parish, Martha Pennington, Jack Richards, Earl Stevick, Rita Wong) and/or materials developers (e.g., Tim Bowen, Rebecca Dauer, Judy Gilbert, Carolyn Graham, Linda

Grant, Mark Hancock, Lynn Henrichsen, Martin Hewings, Linda Lane, Clement Laroy, Jonathan Marks, Sue Miller, Gertrude Orion). Though prominent in the field, these specialists tended not to be empirical researchers, at least not in connection with the teaching of pronunciation. Echoing the models of Celce-Murcia and Pica a decade earlier, some had research agendas focused on areas other than pronunciation teaching. However, a theme worth highlighting is that pronunciation specialists of the 1980s-1990s were not conducting empirical investigations on topics such as which dimensions of L2 phonology are more important to teach or how they might be most effectively taught in language classrooms. For the most part, they were basing their recommendations for pronunciation teaching on (a) their own familiarity with relevant literatures (i.e., they were reading widely and synthesizing well), (b) their experiences as teachers of pronunciation, and (c) their intuitions. While the research base may have been thin, third wave specialists of the 1980s-1990s were successful in integrating imitative-intuitive, analytic-linguistic, and communicative means of teaching pronunciation.

Ontogeny of ESL Pronunciation Teaching in the 20th Century

Implicit in the published work of specialists and materials developers of the 1980s-1990s were provisional answers to some essential research questions (e.g., Which features of English phonology are more important to teach? What is the best sequence for teaching them? Which teaching strategies and methods of teaching are most effective?) but there remained little in the way of empirical research to support their work. This lack of relevant research may reflect the degree of maturation in the field of ESL pronunciation teaching at the time. Nearly a century before, the Reform Movement

had given birth to the modern era by establishing pronunciation teaching as a reputable endeavor and introducing an analytic-linguistic perspective on how to teach. The initial decades of the 20th century witnessed a period of the field's early childhood as research documentation grew concerning how the sound system of English operates along with concurrent blending of both imitative-intuitive and analytic-linguistic instructional approaches. The mid 20th century coincided with a period perhaps best characterized as pronunciation teaching's adolescence. There were early efforts to increase the proportion of analytic-linguistic ways of teaching along with tentative efforts to introduce communicative themes. However, we can also see that advances in pronunciation teaching experienced a maturational backslide in the 1960s as ALM prioritized the imitative-intuitive orientation at the expense of what might have been more substantive innovations. In many parts of the world this stagnation continued throughout the 1970s as confusion continued over how to respond to the wider field's embrace of CLT. Another condition that siphoned attention away from pronunciation teaching during the 1970s-1980s was growing interest in the teaching of L2 reading and L2 writing, a period when ESL learners faced considerable academic literacy demands. L2 reading and L2 writing scholarship was at center stage for ESL teachers who completed their professional training throughout the 1980s-1990s. While L2 pronunciation research lagged behind, L2 reading and L2 writing researchers became some of the field's most prominent leaders. The generation of teachers and scholars they trained comprise a large proportion of today's ESL teachers, material developers, teacher educators, and researchers. Some of the impacts of this historical course of events continue to be felt today. For over two decades, for example, we have had access to a highly respected

journal dedicated specifically to L2 writing and to several even more established journals in which L2 reading research dominates. But a journal dedicated to L2 pronunciation, the *Journal of Second Language Pronunciation*, is scheduled to appear for the first time in 2015. The closest comparable serial publication currently available is *Speak Out!*, a newsletter of IATEFL's Pronunciation Special Interest Group. As often happens with young adults, the teaching of ESL pronunciation from the 1960s through the early 1980s was experiencing a phase of uncertainty and indecision. By the mid 1980s, however, third wave methodologists had begun to explore a more mature direction of instructional possibilities. In the 1990s, this direction was embraced by an even larger number of specialist writers and materials developers. Fortunately, the quality of their work would be further enhanced near the start of the 21st century as empirical researchers began to address a series of unresolved research topics.

A Gap in ESL Pronunciation Teaching (up until the mid-1990s)

Along with the many advances witnessed through the three waves of instructional innovations described thus far, specialists were not producing primary empirical research that advanced the quality of pronunciation teaching. Evidence of this lack of empirical research support may be found in Brown's (1991) then state-of-the-art edited collection. Though one chapter is grounded in empirical research (Brown's own discussion of functional load), the collection included no other such examples. As Deng et al. (2009) point out, Brown (1991) lamented in his introduction that "second language pronunciation research did not receive the degree of attention it merited from researchers" (p. 1). Eighteen years later, Deng et al. reviewed 14 top tier Applied

Linguistics journals for the period 1999-2008 and found that “pronunciation is still underrepresented in the [professional research] literature” (p. 3). It would not be until the mid-1990s that the work of a small number of empiricists began to fill the gap Brown (1991) and Deng et al (2009) identified. Research studies by Macdonald, Yule and Powers (1994), Munro and Derwing (1995), and Wennerstrom (1994) initiated a modern era of primary empirical research to inform the work of ESL pronunciation teaching, an era constituting the field’s contemporary ‘fourth wave.’

The Fourth Wave: Emergence of Empirical Research (mid-1990s – present)

A contemporary theme offered as a way of closing this review reflects recent empirical research being used to inform the teaching of ESL pronunciation. It took well over a century for the Reform Movement to culminate in the growing number of fourth wave empirical researchers who are now investigating topics in three macro-level areas of focus: 1) what features of ESL phonology are necessary to teach; 2) how to effectively teach them, and 3) what teachers and students believe and know about pronunciation instruction. Though there is insufficient space to do justice to all that has been published since the mid-1990s, a few representative examples are provided below. The studies are categorized according to macro-level themes that relate most closely to one of the three topic areas posed above. The majority of the studies listed under the table’s first two macro-level themes represent experimental or quasi-experimental investigations that are at least partially connected to the teaching of ESL pronunciation. In addition, a number of researchers have recently begun to explore some of the dynamic connections which exist between teachers’ and students’ beliefs and actual (or reported) classroom practices.

This most recent research agenda is represented in the table's final section, focusing on teachers' cognition (knowledge and beliefs) and learners' perception about pronunciation instruction. Considered collectively, the three sections constitute the heart of the fourth wave of pronunciation teaching and illustrate several research agendas for the future.

Empirical Research that Supports ESL Pronunciation Teaching
(ESL Pronunciation Teaching's Fourth Wave)

Theme	Empirical Studies (Examples)
<i>Macro-level Theme A: Exploring what to teach in English pronunciation</i>	
Theme 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects of segmentals and suprasegmentals on the intelligibility/ comprehensibility of L2 speech and implications for teaching ESL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field (2005) Hahn (2004) Llurda (2000) Munro & Derwing (1995, 1998) Trofimovich & Baker (2006) Zielinski (2008)
Theme 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects of sociocultural factors on the intelligibility/ comprehensibility of L2 speech and implications for teaching ESL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bent & Bradlow (2003) Deterding (2005) Deterding & Kirkpatrick (2006) Kang (2012) Kennedy & Trofimovich (2008) Matsuura (2007) Munro, Derwing & Morton (2006) Trofimovich & Baker (2006)
Theme 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contrastive analyses of L1 and L2 English speakers' production and implications for teaching ESL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low (2006) Pickering (2001, 2004) Pickering, Hu, & Baker (2012) Setter (2006) Wennerstrom (1994)
<i>Macro-level Theme B: Exploring how to teach pronunciation effectively</i>	
Theme 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing priorities in pronunciation instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Derwing, Munro & Wiebe (1998) Jenkins (2000) Murphy (2014) Munro & Derwing (2006) Saito (2011)
Theme 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of instruction and/or feedback on learner intelligibility and/or phonological improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Couper (2003, 2006, 2011) Derwing, Munro & Wiebe (1997) Dlaska & Krekeler (2013) Levis & Pickering (2004)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lord (2008) • Macdonald, Yule & Powers (1994) • Saito (2007) • Saito & Lyster (2012a) • Tanner & Landon (2009) • Trofimovich, Lightbown, Halter & Song (2009) • Trofimovich & Gatbonton (2006)
Theme 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pronunciation strategies for successful oral communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Osburne (2003)
<i>Macro-level Theme C: Teachers' cognitions (beliefs & knowledge) and learners' perspectives on pronunciation instruction</i>	
Theme 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners' preferences regarding pronunciation instruction, feedback and accents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kang (2010) • Scales, Wennerstrom, Richard & Wu (2006)
Theme 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners' language awareness, aural comprehension skills and improved pronunciation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kennedy & Trofimovich (2010) • Saito (2013)
Theme 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers' beliefs and knowledge about pronunciation instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baker (2011a, 2011b, 2014) • Foote, Holtby, & Derwing (2011) • Jenkins (2005) • Macdonald (2002) • Saito & Lyster (2012b) • Sifakis & Sougari (2005)

Finally, if we may speculate on the future of ESL pronunciation teaching there is every reason to feel optimistic. We sense a momentum building in anticipation of a fifth wave of innovations likely to appear in the coming decade. Some of this anticipated wave's defining characteristics are likely to include:

- promotion of the Wave 1 maxim that *we can and should be teaching pronunciation*;
- refinement of Wave 2's focus on knowledge about phonology (e.g., functional load, intelligibility thresholds, lingua franca core);

- expansion of Wave 3's attention to “pedagogical content knowledge” (Baker, 2014, p. 143);
- a new focus on documenting pronunciation classroom teachers’ “personal practical knowledge” (Golombek, 1998, p. 452);
- continued integration of the first three waves;
- expansion of Wave 4's empirical research base to support instructional innovations.

Beyond continuing impacts of the first four waves, we anticipate the infusion within pronunciation teaching of several core themes currently driving theory, research, and practices of second language teacher development (SLTD). These themes include explorations of science/research, values/beliefs, and art/craft (i.e., apprenticeship) conceptions of L2 teaching (see Freeman and Richards, 1993) along with what Johnson (2006) terms a “sociocultural turn” in research and practices in the professional development of L2 teachers (p. 235). In sum, the coalescence of these general SLTD themes along with an eventual infusion of Wave 4’s empirical research findings in materials development, teacher training, and teachers’ actual classroom practices will serve to constitute pronunciation teaching’s next (5th) wave.

References

Abercrombie, D. (1949a). Teaching pronunciation. *English Language Teaching*, 3(5), 113-122.

- Abercrombie, D. (1949b). 'Some first principles: Part 1, *English Language Teaching*, 3(6), 141-1-6; Part 2: *English Language Teaching*, 3(7), 169-171.
- Abercrombie, D. (1956). *Problems and principles: Studies in the teaching of English as a second language*. London: Longmans, Green.
- Acton, W. (1984). Changing fossilized pronunciation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 71-85.
- Anderson-Hsieh, J. (1989). Approaches toward teaching pronunciation: A brief history. *Cross-Currents*, 16, 73-78.
- Asher, J. (1965). The strategy of the total physical response: An application to learning Russian. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 3, 291-300.
- Avery, P., & Ehrlich, S. (1992). *Teaching American English pronunciation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, A. A. (2011a). Discourse prosody and teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *TESOL Journal*, 2, 263-292.
- Baker, A. A. (2011b). ESL teachers and pronunciation pedagogy: Exploring the development of teachers' cognitions and classroom practices. In J. M. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference, Sept. 2010* (pp. 82-94). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.
- Baker, A. (2014). Exploring teachers' knowledge of L2 pronunciation techniques: Teacher cognitions, observed classroom practices and student perceptions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48, 136-163.
- Bailey, K. M., & Savage, L. (1994). *New ways in teaching speaking*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL

- Beisbier, B. (1994). *Sounds great: low-intermediate pronunciation for speakers of English*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Beisbier, B. (1995). *Sounds great: intermediate pronunciation for speakers of English*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Bell, A. G. (1906). *The mechanism of speech*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.
- Bent, T., & Bradlow, A. (2003). The interlanguage speech intelligibility benefit. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 114, 1600-1610.
- Berlitz, M. (1882). *Méthode pour l'enseignement la langue française dan les écoles Berlitz, première partie*. Boston, MA: Schoenhof. (with E. Dubois).
- Bolinger, D. L. (1947). American English intonation. *American Speech*, 22(2), 134-136.
- Bowen, D. (1972). Contextualizing pronunciation practice in the ESOL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 6, 83-94.
- Bowen, D. (1975). *Patterns of English pronunciation*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Bowen, T., & Marks, J. (1992). *The Pronunciation book: Student-centered activities for pronunciation work*. NY: Longman.
- Brazil, D. (1994). *Pronunciation for advanced learners of English*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brazil (1997). *The communicative value of intonation in English*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Breul, K. (1898/1913). *The teaching of modern foreign languages and the training of teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, A. (Ed.). (1991). *Teaching English pronunciation: A book of readings*. New York: Routledge.

- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language Pedagogy* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, J. D. (2012). *New ways in teaching connected speech*. Alexandria, Virginia: TESOL International Association.
- Burgess, J., & Spencer, S. (2000). Phonology and pronunciation in integrated language teaching and teacher education. *System*, 28, 191-215.
- Burns, A. (2006). Integrating research and professional development on pronunciation teaching in a national adult ESL program. *TESL Reporter*, 39, 34-41.
- Cauldwell, R. (2012). *Cool speech: Hot listening, cool pronunciation*. [iPad application]. Birmingham, UK: Speech In Action.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1983, May). Activities for teaching pronunciation communicatively. *CATESOL News*, pp. 10-11.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1987). Teaching pronunciation as communication. In J. Morley (Ed.), *Current perspectives on pronunciation: Practices anchored in theory* (pp. 5-12). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Goodwin, J. M. (1996). *Teaching pronunciation: A reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., Goodwin, J. M., & Griner, B. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Celce-Murcia, M., & Goodwin, J. (1991). Teaching pronunciation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed., pp. 136-153). New York, NY: Newbury House.
- Chafe, W. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*, 25-55. New York: Academic Press.
- Chan, M. (1987). *Phrase by phrase: Pronunciation and listening in American English*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Chela-Flores, B. (1998). *Teaching English rhythm: From theory to practice*. Caracas, Venezuela: Fondo Editorial Tropykos.
- Clarey, E. & Dixon, R. J. (1947). *Pronunciation exercises in English*. New York: Regents.
- Coleman, A. (1929). *The teaching of modern foreign languages in the United States*. American and Canadian Committees on Modern Languages, Vol. 12. New York.
- Couper, G. (2003). The value of an explicit pronunciation syllabus in ESOL teaching. *Prospect*, 18, 53-70.
- Couper, G. (2006). The short and long-term effects of pronunciation instruction. *Prospect*, 21, 46-66.
- Couper, G. (2011). What makes pronunciation teaching work? Testing the effect of two variables: Socially constructed metalanguage and critical listening. *Language Awareness*, 20(3), 159-182. doi: 10.1080/09658416.2011.570347
- CREDE. (1961). *Voix et images de France: Cours audio-visuel de français premier degré*. London: Harrap. Originally published St Cloud, 1958.

- Dalton, C., & Seidlhofer, B. (1994). *Pronunciation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dauer, R. (1993). *Accurate English: A complete course in pronunciation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Regents Prentice-Hall.
- De Bot, K. (1983). Visual feedback on intonation I: Effectiveness and induced practice behavior. *Language and Speech*, 26, 331-350.
- Deng, J., Holtby, A., Howden-Weaver, L., Nessim, L., Nicholas, B., Nickle, K., Pannekoek, C., Stephan, S., & Sun, M. (2009). *English pronunciation research: The neglected orphan of second language acquisition studies? (WP 05-09)*. Edmonton, AB: Prairie Metropolis Centre.
- Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J., & Wiebe, G. (1997). Pronunciation instruction for "fossilized" learners: Can it help? *Applied Language Learning*, 8, 217-235.
- Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J., & Wiebe, G. (1998). Evidence in favor of a broad framework for pronunciation instruction. *Language Learning*, 48, 393-410.
- Deterding, D. (2005). Listening to estuary English in Singapore. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 425-440.
- Deterding, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2006). Emerging South-East Asian Englishes and intelligibility. *World Englishes*, 25(3/4), 391-409.
- Dlaska, A., & Krekeler, C. (2013). The short-term effects of individual corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation. *System*, 41(1), 25-37. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.005>
- Field, J. (2005). Intelligibility and the listener: The role of lexical stress. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 399-423.

- Foote, J. A., Holtby, A. K., & Derwing, T. M. (2011). Survey of the teaching of pronunciation in adult ESL programs in Canada, 2010. *TESL Canada Journal*, 29, 1-22.
- Fraser, H. (2001). *Teaching pronunciation: A handbook for teachers and trainers: Three frameworks for an integrated approach*. Sydney, Australia: TAFE NSW Access Division.
- Gettegno. C. (1963). *Teaching foreign languages in schools: The silent way*. Reading, England: Educational Explorers Ltd.
- Gilbert, J. B. (1978). Gadgets: Non-verbal tools for teaching pronunciation. *CATESOL Occasional Papers*, 4, 68-78.
- Gilbert, J. B. (2008). Teaching pronunciation: Using the prosody pyramid Retrieved from <http://www.cambridge.org/other_files/downloads/esl/booklets/Gilbert-Teaching-Pronunciation.pdf>
- Gilbert, J. B. (2012a). *Clear speech from the start: Basic pronunciation and listening comprehension in North American English (2nd ed.)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilbert, J. B. (2012b). *Clear speech: Pronunciation and listening comprehension in North American English (4th ed.; 1st ed. 1984)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Glauning, F. (1903). *Didaktik und Methodik des englischen Unterrichts*. Munich.
- Gorsuch, G., Meyers, C., Pickering, L., & Griffiee, D. (2012). *English communication for international teaching assistants (2nd ed.)*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

- Gouin, J. (1880). *The art of studying and teaching languages*. Translation by H. Swan and V. Bétis. Originally published in Paris, 1880. London: George Philip.
- Grant, L. (1993). *Well said: Advanced English pronunciation*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Grant, L. (2007). *Well said intro: Pronunciation for clear communication*. Boston: Thomson/Heinle & Heinle.
- Grant, L. (2010). *Well said: Pronunciation for clear communication (3rd ed.; 1st ed. 1993)*. Boston: Thomson/Heinle & Heinle.
- Hahn, L. D. (2004). Primary stress and intelligibility: Research to motivate the teaching of suprasegmentals. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 201-223.
- Hahn, L., & Dickerson, W. (1999). *Speech craft: Discourse pronunciation for advanced learners*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Hancock, M. (1996). *Pronunciation games*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hancock, M. (2003). *English pronunciation in use (intermediate)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hedge, T. (1988). *Writing: Resource books for teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Henrichsen, L., Green, A., Nishitani, A., & Bagley, C. L. (1999). *Pronunciation matters: Communicative, story-based activities for mastering the sounds of North American English*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Hewings, M. (2004). *Pronunciation practice activities: A resource book for teaching English pronunciation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hewings, M. (2007). *English pronunciation in use (advanced)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornby, A. S. (1950). The situational approach to language teaching. A series of six articles in *English Language Teaching, Vols. I and II*.
- Howatt, A. P. R., & Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *A history of English language teaching (2nd ed.)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hu, G. (2005). Contextual influences on instructional practices: A Chinese case for an ecological approach to ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 635-660.
- Hyland, K. (2003). Writing and teaching writing. *Second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of teacher attitudes and identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 535-543.
- Jespersen, O. (1904). *How to teach a foreign language* (S. Y.-O. Bertelsen, Trans.). London: George Allen & Unwin.
- <<http://archive.org/details/howtoteachforeig00jespuoft>>
- Kang, O. (2010). ESL learners' attitudes toward pronunciation instruction. In J. M. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference* (pp. 105-118). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.

- Kang, O. (2012). Impact of rater characteristics and prosodic features of speaker accentedness on ratings of international teaching assistants' oral performance. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9, 249-269.
- Kelly, G. (2000). *How to teach pronunciation*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- Kelly, L. G. (1969). *25 centuries of language teaching*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Kennedy, S., & Trofimovich, P. (2008). Intelligibility, comprehensibility, and accentedness of L2 speech: The role of listener experience and semantic context. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 64, 459-489.
- Kennedy, S., & Trofimovich, P. (2010). Language awareness and second language pronunciation: A classroom study. *Language Awareness*, 19(3), 171-185. doi: 10.1080/09658416.2010.486439
- Kenworthy, J. (1987). *The teaching of English pronunciation*. New York: Longman.
- Kenyon, J. S. (1928). Correct Pronunciation. *American Speech*, 4, 150-153.
- Kingdon, R. (1958a). *The groundwork of English intonation*. London: Longmans.
- Kingdon, R. (1958b). *The groundwork of English stress*. London: Longmans.
- Ladefoged, P. (2006). *A course in phonetics* (5 ed.). Boston, MA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Lado, R., Fries, C. C., & Robinett, B. W. (1954). *English pronunciation*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Lane, L. (2005). *Focus on pronunciation* (books 1, 2, & 3). White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Lane, L. (2010). *Tips for teaching pronunciation: A practical approach*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Laroy, C. (1995). *Pronunciation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Leather, J. (1983). State of the art: Second-language pronunciation learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 16, 198-219.
- Leather, J. (1999). Second-language speech research: An introduction. *Language Learning*, 49, pp. 1-56.
- Levis, J. (1999). Intonation in theory and practice, revisited. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 37-63.
- Levis, J. M., & Pickering, L. (2004). Teaching intonation in discourse using speech visualization technology. *System*, 32, 505-524.
- Llurda, E. (2000). Effects of intelligibility and speaking rate on judgements of non-native speakers' personalities. *IRAL*, 38, 289-299.
- Long, M., & Crookes, G. (1991). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26, 27-55.
- Lord, G. (2008). Podcasting communities and second language pronunciation. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(2), 364-379. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2008.tb03297.x
- Low, E. L. (2006). A cross-varietal comparison of deaccenting and given information: Implications for international intelligibility and pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 739-761.
- Macdonald, D., Yule, G., & Powers, M. (1994). Attempts to improve English L2 pronunciation: The variable effects of different types of instruction. *Language Learning*, 44, 75-100.
- Macdonald, S. (2002). Pronunciation views and practices of reluctant teachers. *Prospect*, 17, 3-18.

- Marks, J. (2007). *English pronunciation in use (elementary)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marcel, C. (1853). *Language as a means of mental culture and international communication; or, Manual of the teacher and the learner of languages*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Matsuura, H. (2007). Intelligibility and individual learner differences in the EIL context. *System*, 35, 293-304.
- McCutcheon, R. J. (1939). 'Correct Pronunciations'. *American Speech*, 14, 159-160.
- Miller, S. F. (2006). *Targeting pronunciation: Communicating clearly in English (2nd ed.)*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Morley, J. (1984). *Listening and language learning in ESL*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Morley, J. (Ed.). (1987). *Current perspectives on pronunciation: Practices anchored in theory*. Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Morley, J. (1991). The pronunciation component in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 481-520.
- Morley, J. (1994). A multidimensional curriculum design for speech-pronunciation instruction. In J. Morley (Ed.), *Pronunciation pedagogy and theory: New views, new directions* (pp. 64-91). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Munro, M.J. & Derwing, T.M. (1995). Foreign accent, comprehensibility and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning*, 45, 73-97.

- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1998). The effects of speaking rate on listener evaluations of native and foreign-accented speech. *Language Learning*, 48, 159-182.
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (2006). The functional load principle in ESL pronunciation instruction: An exploratory study. *System*, 34, 520-531.
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (2011). Research timeline: The foundations of accent and intelligibility in pronunciation research. *Language Teaching*, 44, 316-327. Cambridge University Press.
- Munro, M. J., Derwing, T. M., & Morton, S. L. (2006). The mutual intelligibility of L2 speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 111-131.
- Murphy, J. (1997). Phonology courses offered by MATESOL programs in the US. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 741-764.
- Murphy, J. (2013). *Teaching pronunciation*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL International Association.
- Murphy, J. M. (2014). Intelligible, comprehensible, nonnative models in ESL/EFL pronunciation teaching. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistic*, 42, 258-269.
- Naiman, N. (1987). Teaching pronunciation communicatively. In P. Avery & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *The teaching of pronunciation: An introduction for teachers of English as a second language* [Special issue]. *TESL Talk*, 17, 141-147.
- Nunan, D., & Miller, L. (1995). *New ways in teaching listening*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

- O'Connor, J. D., & Arnold, G. F. (1961). *Intonation of colloquial English*. London: Longmans.
- Osburne, A. G. (2003). Pronunciation strategies of advanced ESOL learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 41, 131-143.
- Palmer, H. E. (1917). *The scientific study and teaching of languages*. London: Harrap.
- Palmer, H. E. (1924). *The grammar of spoken English, on a strickly phonetic basis*. Cambridge: Heffer.
- Passy, P. (1888). Our revised alphabet. *The Phonetic Teacher*, 57-60.
- Pennington, M., & Richards, J. C. (1986). Pronunciation revisited. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 207-225.
- Pica, T. (1984). Pronunciation activities with an accent on communication. *English Teaching Forum*, 22, 2-6.
- Pickering, L. (2001). The role of tone choice in improving ITA communication in the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 233-255.
- Pickering, L. (2004). The structure and function of intonational parapgraphs in native and nonnative speaker instructional discourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 19-43.
- Pickering, L., Hu, G., & Baker, A. A. (2012). The pragmatic function of intonation: Cueing agreement and disagreement in spoken English discourse and implications for ELT. In J. Romeo (Ed.), *Pragmatics, prosody and English language teaching* (pp. 199-218). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Pike, K. L. (1945). *The intonation of American English*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

- Prator, C. (1951). *Manual of American English pronunciation for adult foreign students*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Prator, C., & Robinett, B. W. (1985/1972/1957). *Manual of American English pronunciation* (4th ed.). (3rd ed. 1972; 2nd ed. 1957). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Poedjosoedarmo, G. (2003). *Teaching pronunciation: Why, what, when, and how*. Singapore: RELC Portfolio Series.
- Pourhosein Gilakjani, A. (2012). The significance of pronunciation in English language teaching. *English Language Teaching* (Canadian Center of Science and Education), 5, 96-107.
- Predergast, T. (1864). *The mastery of languages, or, the art of speaking foreign tongues idiomatically*. London: R. Bently.
- Reed, M., & Michaud, C. (2005). *Sound concepts: An integrated pronunciation course*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogerson-Revell, P. (2011). *English phonology and pronunciation teaching*. London: Continuum.
- Saito, K. (2007). The influence of explicit phonetic instruction on pronunciation teaching in EFL settings: The case of English vowels and Japanese learners of English. *The Linguistics Journal*, 3, 16-40.
- Saito, K. (2011). Identifying Problematic Segmental Features to Acquire Comprehensible Pronunciation in EFL Settings: The Case of Japanese Learners of English. *REL C Journal*, 42, 363-378.

- Saito, K. (2013). Re-examining effects of form-focused instruction on L2 pronunciation development: The role of explicit phonetic information. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35(1), 1-29. doi: 10.1017/S0272263112000666
- Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2012a). Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of /r/ by Japanese learners of English. *Language Learning*, 62, 595-683.
- Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2012b). Investigating the pedagogical potential of recasts for L2 vowel acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46, 387-398.
- Sauveur, L. (1874). *Introduction to the teaching of living languages without grammar or dictionary*. Boston: Schoenhof and Moeller.
- Scales, J., Wennerstrom, A., Richard, D., & Wu, S. H. (2006). Language learners' perceptions of accent. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 715-738.
- Setter, J. (2006). Speech rhythm in world Englishes: The case of Hong Kong. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 763-782.
- Setter, J., & Jenkins, J. (2005). State-of-the-art review article: Pronunciation. *Language Teaching*, 38, 1-17.
- Sifakis, N. C., & Sougari, A.-M. (2005). Pronunciation issues and EIL pedagogy in the periphery: A survey of Greek state school teachers' beliefs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 467-488.
- Sledd, J. (1960). [Review of the book *The groundwork of English intonation*, by Roger Kingdon]. *Language*, 36(1), 173-179.
- Sweet, H. (1880–1881). Sound notation. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 177-235.

- Tanner, M. W., & Landon, M. M. (2009). The effects of computer-assisted pronunciation readings on ESL learners' use of pausing, stress, intonation, and overall comprehensibility. *Language learning and Technology*, 13, 51-65.
- Terrell, T. (1977). A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 6, 325-337.
- Trofimovich, P., & Baker, W. (2006). Learning second language suprasegmentals: Effect of L2 experience on prosody and fluency characteristics of L2 speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 1-30.
- Trofimovich, P., & Gatbonton, E. (2006). Repetition and focus on form in L2 Spanish word processing: Implications for pronunciation instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 519-535.
- Trofimovich, P., Lightbown, P. H., Halter, R. H., & Song, H. (2009). Comprehension-based practice: The development of L2 pronunciation in a listening and reading program. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 31, 609-639.
- Underhill, A. (1994). *Sound foundations: Living phonology*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar practice activities*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Ek, J. A. (1973). *The 'threshold level' in a unit/credit system*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Vietor, W. (1882). *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren! Ein beitrag zur Überbürdungsfrage*. Under the pseudonym Quousque Tandem. Heilbronn: Henninger.
- Walker, R. (2010). *Teaching the pronunciation of English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Wells, J. C. (1998 Aug 13). Obituary: 'Doc' O'Connor: Sound scholar, *The Guardian*, p. 018.
- Wennerstrom, A. (1994). Intonational meaning in English discourse: A study of non-native speakers. *Applied Linguistics*, 15, 399-421.
- West, M. (1927/1935). *New methods readers*. Calcutta: Longmans, Green.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1972). The teaching of English as communication. *English Language Teaching*, 27, 15-19.
- Wilson, G. P. (1937). Standards of correct pronunciation. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 23, 568-576.
- Wong, R. (1987). *Teaching pronunciation: Focus on English rhythm and intonation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Zielinski, B. W. (2008). The listener: No longer the silent partner in reduced intelligibility. *System*, 36, 69-84.